



Juvenile Probation and Camp Funding

Report to CSA Board

Corrections Standards Authority
600 Bercut Drive
Sacramento, CA 95814
www.csa.ca.gov

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Fixed Allocation Funding	2-5
■ Program Administration	
■ Program Expenditures	
■ Program Data Analysis	
Camp Funding	5-6
■ Camp Allocation Funding	
■ New Camps Added to the Program	
Appendices	
A. Assembly Bill 139	
B. Fourth Quarter Camp Allocation	

Executive Summary

In July 2005, Governor Schwarzenegger signed legislation that appropriated over \$168.7 million in state funds to support a broad spectrum of county probation services targeting at-risk youth, juvenile offenders (those on probation as well as those detained in local juvenile facilities), and the families of these youth (AB 139, Chapter 74). All counties are eligible for a portion of the appropriation, with amounts based on the fiscal year 2004-05 allocation schedule outlined in statute (Attachment A). AB 139 also provided \$32.7 million for specified services in counties that operate juvenile camps and/or ranches. The camp-specific funds are allocated to counties on a quarterly basis according to the number of occupied camp/ranch beds up to the Corrections Standards Authority rated maximum capacity. A copy of the enabling legislation, AB 139, is attached as Appendix A.

The legislation directed the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) to administer these funds, and CDCR entrusted the Corrections Standards Authority (CSA) with this responsibility. For administrative purposes, the CSA refers to this effort as the Juvenile Probation and Camps Funding (JPCF) Program.

The JPCF Program, in effect, replaces the Comprehensive Youth Services Act, which provided federal dollars to county probation departments, beginning in 1997-98, through the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. The TANF program was administered by the California Department of Social Services. Counties used these federal dollars to fund services and programs across the continuum of options, from prevention/early intervention through custody. According to surveys conducted by the Chief Probation Officers of California, over 40,000 at-risk youth received TANF services in 2003-04, and similar numbers received services while on probation. The largest numbers of youths were served in juvenile halls, camps and ranches, with over 100,000 youths receiving services while incarcerated.

Program Administration: In keeping with CSA's practice of involving critical stakeholders in the development of new programs, CSA staff convened a representative group of Chief Probation Officers, county probation department business managers, and executive staff of the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC) to discuss statutory requirements and other issues related to program administration. In September of 2005, the CSA's Acting Executive Director sent an announcement to all CPOs about the JPCF program. The announcement requested feedback on a draft Program Agreement as well as a Program Administration Guide developed by staff to assist probation departments in meeting their obligations. Additionally, in order to ensure fiscal and programmatic accountability, CSA staff (in collaboration with the CPOC workgroup) developed a Semi-Annual Progress Report designed to collect information needed to monitor counties' compliance with JPCF Program requirements and to assess program performance. Copies of the finalized documents were sent to CPOs in October of 2005.

Staff developed an on-line invoicing system for counties to use in claiming expenditures of their program-specific JPCF appropriation. Additionally, staff also developed a mechanism for collecting monthly camp population data.

All funds allocated to counties through the JPCF Program are intended to support the delivery of services authorized by the enabling legislation. There are 23 categories of services eligible for expenditures. The service categories are listed in Table 1:

Table 1
The 23 Service Categories Authorized in the JPCF Program

1. Educational Advocacy/Attendance Monitoring	13. Respite Care
2. Mental Health Assessment/Counseling	14. Counseling, Monitoring, & Treatment
3. Home Detention	15. Gang Intervention
4. Social Responsibility Training	16. Sex and Health Education
5. Family Mentoring	17. Anger Mgmt., Violence Prevention, Conflict Resolution
6. Parent Peer Support	18. Aftercare Services
7. Life Skills Counseling	19. Information/Referral-Community Services
8. Prevocational/Vocational Training	20. Case Management
9. Family Crisis Intervention	21. Therapeutic Day Treatment
10. Ind., Family, & Group Counseling	22. Transportation for JPF Services
11. Parenting Skills Development	23. Emergency and Temporary Shelter
12. Drug and Alcohol Education	

FIXED ALLOCATION FUNDING

Program Expenditures: By June 30, 2006, the 57 counties participating (Alpine County chose not to receive funds) in the JPCF had completed Program Agreements with CSA. Due to the fact that many program agreements were not in place during the first and second quarters of FY 2005-06, counties did not complete invoicing until September 19, 2006. However, counties were able to encumber and expend 99.8 percent of the \$168.7 million JPCF appropriation. Additionally, the entire \$32.7 million camp-specific appropriation was dispersed to the 29 counties that operated juvenile camps and/or ranches. It should be noted that while the program-specific JPCF allocation to each county is fixed in statute, the camp-specific allocation will vary annually based upon proportionate number of occupied camp/ranch beds in each county.

Program Data Analysis: As this is the initial year of the JPCF program, there are several factors that should be considered when reviewing the JPCF data. The Semi-Annual Progress Report was not developed and released to the counties until the second quarter of the fiscal year. During the first six months of the fiscal year counties gathered general program information but they were not aware of the specific data elements that would be required in the progress report. CSA continued to process Program Agreements throughout the year, yet some counties had not completed their program agreement during the first six months of the fiscal year. Consequently, five (5) counties were only able to provide data for one semi-annual progress report period.

The JPCF program funds a continuum of programs and probation services ranging from prevention/intervention to custody. The 57 counties involved in the JPCF Program reported on the activities of 145 separate programs and services. Some of the data elements relating to program specific services (i.e., number of minors completing a program, number of minors failing due to re-offense, etc) are not directly transferable to direct probation services in a detention setting. Additionally, programs offered in a custody setting frequently have reduced completion rates due to minors being released prior to completing the program. The average length of stay for minors in a California juvenile hall is 37.6 days¹. Minor will receive assessment and treatment services during their stay but counties due not classify the minor as having “completed” a program upon release.

Despite these limitations, the data submitted by counties for FY 2005-06 regarding the JPCF fixed allocation indicate that 148,855 at-risk youth received direct services. Additionally, since the JPCF program allows the expenditure of funds to provide services to the family members of at-risk youth, counties provided services to 72,811 family members (who reside with the minor) in order to promote family stability. Table 2 provides a summary of the number of minors and family members served by the JPCF Program.

Table 2
Minors and Family Members involved in the JPCF program in 2005-06

Number of Minors Who Entered		148,855
Number of Minors Who Exited		127,373
Exit Reason	Completed a Program	63,471
	Failed due to new offense	2,569
	Failed due to a program violation	7,986
	Moved or terminated for other reason	53,272
Number of Family Members Who Received Services		72,811

The data show a very low rate of program failures for minors involved in the JPCF Program. Only 2,569 minors, or 1.7 % of the total number of minors involved, failed a program due to committing a new offense. The number of minors failing a program due to a violation of program rules was 7,986 or 5.4 % of the total number served. The combined total for the number of minors who have failed a program is 10,555 or 7.1% of the total number of minors involved in the JPCF Program

The number of minors listed as “Moved or Terminated for Other Reasons” is a statistically significant amount of 53,272 or 35.8%, which merits further analysis. While minors on probation, and their families, may be more transitory in their residency than the general population, the relatively high number is related to the fact that some counties used JPCF funds to provide programs in their juvenile detention facilities. As aforementioned, minors participating in custody-based programs are frequently released prior to the completion of a program. Additionally, even if a minor did complete a program of counseling or therapy during a period of detention, counties have been hesitant to designate a released minor as having “completed a program” merely because his/her period of confinement has ended. In fact, the two most populous counties in California, Los Angeles and San Diego, provided JPCF services to 27,826 and 9,636 minors, respectively, in their detention facilities. All of the minors that received JPCF services while incarcerated in Los Angeles and San Diego juvenile halls were listed as “Moved or Terminated for Other Reasons”. Table 3 demonstrates the impact that the two most populous counties had on the overall statewide numbers.

Table 3
Minors Listed as “Moved or Terminated for Other Reasons”

Total Number Reported Statewide	53,272	100%
Los Angeles County	27,826	52%
San Diego County	9,636	18%
Los Angeles and San Diego Combined	37,462	70%

It should be noted that the designation of minors as “Moved or Terminated for Other Reasons” rather than “Completed” once they are released from detention is primarily related to secure detention in juvenile halls. Minors completing juvenile camp and ranch commitments are included in the “Completed a Program” category. The numbers in Table 3 for Los Angeles and San Diego counties represent only minors detained in juvenile halls, not camps or ranches.

The data also demonstrate that probation departments continue to successfully collaborate with other local agencies and community based organizations to provide comprehensive services to both youth and their families. Probation Departments, as the lead agency, collaborated most often with Mental Health Departments and Local School Districts, while District Attorneys, other Local Law Enforcement, Child Welfare Agencies, and the Courts were also involved. Counties reported that 502 Community Based Organizations provided services to youth under the JPCF program.

Service Categories: All funds allocated to counties under the JPCF program must be expended under one or more of the 23 authorized service categories as specified in the enabling legislation. The data show that counties provided services across the entire spectrum of the 23 service categories, with every service category being used more than once. The majority of the 145 programs and services operated by the 57 participating counties reported that services were provided under multiple service categories. In fact, very few programs provided specific services under only one service category. For example, electronic monitoring programs would be reported only under the service category Home Detention. However, an aftercare program would typically provide services under the following categories: Educational Advocacy/Attendance Monitoring, Mental Health Counseling, Information/Community Services Referral, and Aftercare Services.

In reviewing the specific service categories utilized by the 145 JPCF funded activities, certain trends and emerging priorities in the delivery of probation services become evident. The increasing collaboration between probation departments and local school districts was demonstrated by the fact that the most frequently reported service category was Educational Advocacy/Attendance Monitoring. Furthermore, only five (5) service categories were used by more than half of 145 total programs/services. Table 4 lists the top five service categories and the number of programs/services reporting data:

Table 4
Top Five JPCF Service Categories

JPCF Service Category	# of programs/services using this category
Educational Advocacy/Attendance Monitoring	88
Case Management	86
Information/Community Service Referrals	81
Counseling, Monitoring, and Treatment	80
Drug and Alcohol Education	78

CAMP FUNDING

Camp Allocations: AB 139 allocated \$32.7 million for the support of juvenile probation camps and ranches. The legislation specifies that the funds shall be distributed among counties that operate juvenile camps and ranches based on the number of occupied beds, up to the Corrections Standards Authority rated maximum capacity. Unlike the fixed allocation amounts for counties, the camp allocations will fluctuate based upon the total number of camp beds and occupancy reported by each participant county. If a county adds a probation camp, or increases the number of beds at an existing facility, then the amount of funding received by other counties will be directly impacted as the total number of camp beds is adjusted.

In consultation with the Chief Probation Officers of California, CSA staff developed a mechanism for collecting monthly camp population data from counties. Using the population reports and the CSA board rated maximum capacity; Camp funds are disbursed to counties on a quarterly basis.

To establish a camp or ranch eligible for JPCF Program funding, the county must submit an ordinance to CSA from their respective county Board of Supervisors (See Welfare and Institutions Code Section 881). CSA staff from the Facility Standards and Operations Division will inspect the camp/ranch in order to develop a CSA board rated maximum capacity. CSA staff will also assign the new camp a facility number for tracking.

At the close of Fiscal Year 2004-05, there were 26 counties with CSA recognized camps or ranches. By the end of the 2005-06 Fiscal Year, four facilities had been added to the camp funding program and the number of counties with camps increased to 29. Table 5 lists the facilities added during the 2005-06 Fiscal Year. It should be noted that Tulare County was already participating in the camp portion of the JPCF program when it opened a second camp facility on April 1, 2006.

Table 5
Camps Added to the JPCF Program during FY 2005-06

County	Facility Name	Date Opened	Rated Capacity
El Dorado County	South Tahoe Challenge Camp	11/15/05	20
Merced County	Bear Creek Academy	1/1/06	60
Trinity County	Trinity Mountain	7/1/05	6
Tulare County	Detention Facility Camp	4/1/06	30

The entire \$32.7 million appropriated in Fiscal Year 2005-06 was disbursed to 29 counties eligible for cap-specific funding. A spreadsheet detailing the final camp allocation for Fiscal Year 2005-06 is attached as Appendix B.

APPENDIX A

Assembly Bill 139

SEC. 74. Chapter 3.2 (commencing with Section 18220) is added to Part 6 of Division 9 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, to read:

CHAPTER 3.2. JUVENILE PROBATION FUNDING

18220. (a) (1) The Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, commencing July 1, 2005, shall administer funds appropriated for the purposes of this chapter and allocated pursuant to this section.
- (2) For purposes of this chapter, "department" means the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.
- (b) (1) The department shall administer this chapter, including the establishment of agreements with all county probation departments that receive funding under this chapter.
- (2) (A) Subject to the availability of funds in the annual Budget Act, the department shall be responsible for allocating funds to counties.
- (B) Commencing with the 2005-06 fiscal year, the department shall allocate one hundred sixty-eight million seven hundred thirteen thousand dollars (\$168,713,000) among counties based on the allocation schedule specified in this subparagraph. In any year in which the total amount appropriated by the Legislature for the purposes of this section differs from the total amount provided in the 2004-05 fiscal year, the amount appropriated shall be apportioned to counties based on the 2004-05 fiscal year allocation schedule as follows:

Alameda.....\$6,667,935	Kings\$647,746	Placer\$450,012	Sierra\$6,168
Alpine\$584	Lake\$314,736	Plumas\$46,127	Siskiyou\$126,526
Amador.....\$100,667	Lassen\$91,671	Riverside\$5,438,322	Solano\$1,748,360
Butte\$538,712	Los Angeles...\$67,713,506	Sacramento....\$3,602,070	Sonoma\$2,200,569
Calaveras.....\$103,092	Madera\$404,791	San Benito\$360,418	Stanislaus.....\$889,952
Colusa\$57,526	Marin\$631,365	San Bernardino..\$5,856,862	Sutter\$226,793
Contra Costa...\$4,493,504	Mariposa\$22,394	San Diego\$9,463,866	Tehama\$243,674
Del Norte\$197,338	Mendocino.....\$333,240	San Francisco..\$3,232,706	Trinity\$58,342
El Dorado\$508,807	Merced\$584,419	San Joaquin\$1,493,704	Tulare\$2,381,471
Fresno\$3,635,282	Modoc\$36,005	San Luis Obispo...\$1,013,424	Tuolumne\$119,136
Glenn\$90,484	Mono\$12,013	San Mateo\$3,201,176	Ventura\$2,900,636
Humboldt\$286,072	Monterey\$1,018,813	Santa Barbara...\$2,794,054	Yolo\$429,067
Imperial\$572,419	Napa\$593,942	Santa Clara\$9,799,213	Yuba\$189,721
Inyo\$241,575	Nevada\$209,805	Santa Cruz.....\$1,033,949	Total\$168,713,000
Kern\$4,333,734	Orange\$14,270,138	Shasta\$694,367	

(C) Commencing with the 2005-06 fiscal year, the department shall allocate thirty-two million seven hundred thousand dollars (\$32,700,000) among counties that operate juvenile camps and ranches based on the number of occupied beds in each camp as of 12:01 a.m. each day, up to the Corrections Standards Authority rated maximum capacity, as determined by the Corrections Standards Authority.

18221. (a) Subject to the availability of funds for the purposes described in this section, funds provided pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) of Section 18220 may be used to serve children who are habitual truants, runaways, at risk of being wards of the court under Section 601 or 602, or under juvenile court supervision or supervision of the probation department. Funds may be used to serve parents or other family members of these children if serving them will promote increased self-sufficiency, personal responsibility, and family stability for the child. Services shall be provided pursuant to a family service plan. When a family is served by multiple public agencies or in need of services from multiple public agencies, the family service plan shall be developed through an interdisciplinary approach that shall include representatives from agencies that provide services to the family or that may be required to implement the service plan.

(b) Services authorized under this section include all of the following:

- (1) Educational advocacy and attendance monitoring.
- (2) Mental health assessment and counseling.
- (3) Home detention.
- (4) Social responsibility training.
- (5) Family mentoring.
- (6) Parent peer support.
- (7) Life skills counseling.
- (8) Direct provision of, and referral to, prevocational and vocational training.
- (9) Family crisis intervention.
- (10) Individual, family, and group counseling.
- (11) Parenting skills development.
- (12) Drug and alcohol education.
- (13) Respite care.
- (14) Counseling, monitoring, and treatment.
- (15) Gang intervention.
- (16) Sex and health education.
- (17) Anger management, violence prevention, and conflict resolution.
- (18) Aftercare services as juveniles transition back into the community and reintegrate into their families.
- (19) Information and referral regarding the availability of community services.
- (20) Case management.
- (21) Therapeutic day treatment.
- (22) Transportation related to any of the services described in this subdivision.
- (23) Emergency and temporary shelter.